



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,407	01/11/2002	Dennis M. Hilton	621P001	8920

7590

08/24/2005

Kevin S. Lemack
Nields & Lemack
176 E. Main Street
Westboro, MA 01581

EXAMINER

TOOMER, CEPHIA D.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,407

Applicant(s)

HILTON ET AL.

Examiner

Cephia D. Toomer

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-8,10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-8,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the amendment filed May 18, 2005 in which claim 1 was amended. It should be noted that claims 10-11 were inadvertently omitted from the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a). However, as can be seen throughout the prosecution of this application these claims have stood rejected. The examiner is reinserting the claims in the present Office action.

The Double Patenting rejections are withdrawn in view of Applicant filing Terminal Disclaimers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao (US 5,109,030) in view of SU 1743887 for the reasons of record.

3. Claims 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao (US 5,109,030) in view of SU 1743887 further in view of Nebesnak (US 6,475,275) for the reasons of record.

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claims are now commensurate in scope with the showings of record. Applicant argues that the results of record demonstrate to the skilled artisan that it is the method of the present invention and not the amounts of

Art Unit: 1714

components that results in the surprising and unexpected results. Applicant argues that the pre-foaming step in Chao would render the process commercially useless, regardless of the particular identity or amounts of binder and stabilizer.

The examiner has reviewed the results of record and maintains that the combination of Chao, SU '887 and Nebesnak teach the present invention. Applicant has shown that the preferred method of Chao produces less than desirable results. However, Chao teaches that the foamed composition may also be prepared by mechanically foaming a mixture containing a prefoam component (a mixture of water and the foam stabilizer) with a hydraulic slurry (see col. 7, lines 11-14). Chao does not have to produce a prefoam and therefore, the method of Chao would not render the process commercially useless.

Applicant argues that Claim 1 expressly requires that the formed slurry be conveyed to a length of hose and that a sufficient amount of gas be introduced into the slurry in the length of hose at a flow rate and pressure sufficient to cause the slurry to foam. Applicant argues that no vortex-forming elements are required to form the foam.

Chao teaches that the foam may be prepared by any method known in the art including using compressed air and water. SU teaches using compressed air to feed the foaming solution into the sleeve of the mixing chamber. The present claims do not exclude a vortex-mixing chamber and SU clearly sets forth that the amount of gas introduced into the slurry is sufficient to cause the slurry to foam.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cephia D. Toomer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

10044407\082005